arXiv:1301.6832v2 [gr-qc] 5 Feb 2013

QCD ghost dark energy can not (even roughly) explain the main features of the accepted cosmological paradigm

Ricardo García-Salcedo,[1, a] Tame Gonzalez,[2, b] Israel Quiros,[3, c] and Michael Thompson-Montero[4, d]
[1]*Centro de Investigacion en Ciencia Aplicada y Tecnologia Avanzada - Legaria del IPN, México D.F., México.*
[2]*Departamento de Ingeniería Civil, División de Ingeniería, Universidad de Guanajuato, Gto., México.*
[3]*Departamento de Matemáticas, Centro Universitario de Ciencias Exáctas e Ingenierías,*
Universidad de Guadalajara, Guadalajara, Jal., México.
[4]*Departamento de Física, Centro Universitario de Ciencias Exáctas e Ingenierías,*
Universidad de Guadalajara, Guadalajara, Jal., México.
(Dated: February 6, 2013)

We explore the whole phase space of the so called Veneziano/QCD ghost dark energy models where the dynamics of the inner trapping horizon is neglected and also the more realistic models where the time-dependence of the horizon is taken into consideration. Both cases with and without additional non-gravitational interaction between cold dark matter and ghost dark energy are scrutinized. We pay special attention to the choice of phase space variables leading to bounded and compact phase space so that no critical point of physical interest is missing. It is demonstrated that ghost dark energy is not a suitable candidate to explain the presently accepted cosmological paradigm since no critical point associated with neither dark matter nor radiation dominance is found in the phase space relevant to the model. A transient stage of matter dominance – responsible for the observed amount of cosmic structure – is an essential ingredient of the accepted cosmological paradigm. The above drawbacks are in addition to the well known problem with classical instability against small perturbations of the background density originated from negativity of the sound speed squared.

PACS numbers: 05.45.-a, 05.70.Jk, 95.36.+x, 98.80.-k

I. INTRODUCTION

The nature of the present stage of accelerated expansion of the universe remains as one of the unexplained mysteries in physics. Assuming Einstein's general relativity (GR) is right leads to a multiplicity of models which explain the current inflationary stage of the cosmic evolution within appropriate data accuracy [1, 2]. In spite of their relative success none of these models looks like a convincing alternative due to several outcomes, such as: i) the cosmological constant problems, ii) the coincidence problem, iii) stability issues, etc. Ghost dark energy (GDE) models belong in this vast gallery [3–14]. Here the cosmological constant arises from the contribution of the so called Veneziano/QCD ghost fields [15]. Although in flat Minkowski spacetime the QCD ghosts are unphysical and make no contribution, in curved/time-dependent backgrounds the cancellation of their contribution to the vacuum energy leave a small energy density $\rho \sim \Lambda^3_{QCD} H$, where H is the Hubble parameter and $\Lambda_{QCD} \sim 100MeV$ is the QCD mass scale [3–5, 16, 17]. A very attractive feature of the QCD GDE models is linked with the fact that nothing behind the standard model (SM) of particles and GR is required to explain the origin of the dark energy. There is, however, a serious objection against these cosmological models in connection with the stability issue. In Ref.[6] the cosmological dynamics of a simple model where the GDE energy density is proportional to the Hubble parameter [5] (we use natural units $8\pi G \equiv 8\pi/m^2_{PL} \equiv c \equiv 1$)

$$\rho_{gde} = \alpha H, \;\; \alpha \sim \Lambda^3_{QCD}, \tag{1}$$

was investigated. The authors found that the squared sound speed of GDE is negative in the model $c^2_s = dp_{gde}/d\rho_{gde} < 0$, resulting in an instability against small perturbations of the background energy density $\delta\rho \propto \exp(\omega t)\exp(i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r})$. The issue was investigated in detail in [9] where it was found that, due to non-positivity of the squared sound speed, both non-interacting and interacting GDE models are classically unstable against perturbations in flat and non-flat Friedmann-Robertson-Walker (FRW) backgrounds. Although several authors dismiss the instability problem raised by negativity of c^2_s by arguing that the Veneziano ghost is not a physical propagating degree of freedom and the corresponding GDE model does not violate unitarity causality or gauge invariance [4, 10, 14], others do not find the argument convincing.

Other aspects of GDE models such as: i) equivalence

---

[a] Electronic address: rigarcias@ipn.mx
[b] Electronic address: tamegc72@gmail.com
[c] Electronic address: iquiros6403@gmail.com
[d] Electronic address: mike˙132001@hotmail.com

with kinetic k-essence [10], ii) connection with Brans-Dicke, and $f(R)$ theories, and tachyons [11], and iii) thermodynamical issues [12], have been also investigated. In the latter case the QCD GDE energy density ρ_{gde} is shown to be related with the radius of the trapping horizon $\tilde{r}_T$ [12]: $\rho_{gde} = \alpha(1-\epsilon)/\tilde{r}_T = \alpha(1-\epsilon)\sqrt{H^2+k/a^2}$, where $\epsilon \equiv \dot{\tilde{r}}_T/2H\tilde{r}_T$. If neglect spatial curvature, as we do in this paper, the trapping horizon is coincident with the Hubble horizon $\tilde{r}_T = 1/H$, and

$$\rho_{gde} = \alpha(1-\epsilon)H, \;\; \epsilon = -\dot{H}/2H^2. \tag{2}$$

Usually the contribution from time-dependence of the radius of the horizon ($\propto \epsilon$) is neglected [3–6, 8–13]. However, this is a particular case which, strictly speaking, corresponds to dark energy dominance. Hence, this is no more than a convenient approximation which can not be intended to explain the whole extent of the cosmic history. In general, the contribution of ϵ to the dynamics has to be taken under consideration as it is done, for instance, in [14]. In that reference the global dynamical behavior of the universe accelerated by the QCD GDE, where $\rho_{gde} = \alpha(1-\epsilon)\sqrt{H^2+k/a^2}$, was investigated by using the dynamical systems tools. The authors considered the general situation when there is additional non-gravitational interaction between the QCD GDE and the CDM, given by an interaction term – source term in the continuity equations – of the form

$$Q = 3H(a\,\rho_{gde} + b\,\rho_{cdm}), \tag{3}$$

where the constants a, b, are adjustable free parameters which, for definiteness, we shall take to be positive quantities. Depending on the values of these free parameters two critical points of physical relevance were found. Due to the choice of phase space variables in [14] ($\Omega_i \equiv \rho_i/3H^2$): $\mu = \Omega_{cdm}/\Omega_{gde}$, and ϵ, both points $P_k : (\mu_k, \epsilon_k)$, $k = 1, 2$, are correlated with CDM/GDE-scaling behavior since $\mu_k \neq 0$,

$$P_1 : \left(\frac{a}{1-b}, 0\right), \;\; P_2 : \left(-\frac{3a}{3b+1}, 1\right).$$

If remove the non-gravitational interaction ($a = b = 0$) one would have, instead, $P_1 : (0, 0)$, and $P_2 : (0, 1)$. In the non-interacting case the critical points will correspond to GDE-dominated solutions ($\Omega_{gde} = 1$). The additional non-gravitational interaction between GDE and CDM transforms these critical points into GDE/CDM-scaling equilibrium points. In either case there are not critical points which can be associated with matter dominance. Hence, on the basis of this result the QCD GDE cosmological model may be ruled out as it is unable to explain the formation of structure in our universe.

Before making any conclusive argument against QCD GDE models on the basis of the results of the dynamical systems study in [14], we note that the study in that reference is unsatisfactory due to a problem with the choice of the variables of the phase space. Actually, if take into account (2) we can rewrite the variable μ as $\mu = \rho_{cdm}/\alpha(1-\epsilon)H$, i. e., μ and ϵ do not actually take independent values. As a consequence, for instance, the critical point P_2 may not exist since at $\epsilon = 1$ the variable μ is undefined in general. Moreover, the variable μ above is unsatisfactory in yet another regard: it is unbounded $0 \leq \mu < \infty$. This means, in particular, that critical points associated with CDM dominance – if any – are at infinity and may be lost. For that reason, perhaps, the authors of the mentioned study apply, additionally, the qualitative technique of the so called 'nullcline' to complement the dynamical systems investigation and they found that, for a given region in parameter space, and depending on the initial conditions, the end point of the cosmic evolution can be dominated by matter.

In the present paper we aim at a throughout investigation of the phase space dynamics of QCD GDE cosmological models. We consider separately the cases where the time-dependence of the radius of the horizon is neglected (1) and when it is taken into consideration (2). For completeness we study also the impact of additional non-gravitational interactions depicted by an interaction term of the form (3). We pay special attention to a consistent choice of phase space variables leading, in particular, to bounded and compact phase space so that no critical point of physical relevance is missing. The results of our study will show that, as a matter of fact, since no critical point is found which may be correlated with transient matter (or radiation) dominance, the more realistic QCD GDE models where time-dependence of the horizon's radius is taken into account, can not explain the formation of structure in our universe. This drawback is in addition to the well known problem with classical instability against small perturbations of the background density originated from negativity of the sound speed squared [6, 9].

II. REMARKS ON PHASE SPACE ANALYSIS

Usually the way to test the (theoretical/observational) viability of a given cosmological model is through using known solutions of the cosmological field equations or by seeking for new particular solutions that are physically plausible. However, in general, the cosmological field equations are very difficult to solve exactly and even when an analytic solution can be found it will not be unique but just one in a large set of them. This is not to talk about stability of given solutions. An alternative way around is to invoke the dynamical systems tools to extract useful information about the asymptotic properties of the model instead. In this regard knowledge of the critical (also equilibrium or fixed) points in the phase space corresponding to a given cosmological model is a very important information since, independent on the initial conditions chosen, the orbits of the corresponding autonomous system of ordinary differential equations (ODE) will always evolve for some time in the neighbourhood of these points. Besides, if the point were a global attractor, independent of the initial conditions, the orbits will always be attracted towards it either into the past or into the future. Going back to the original cosmological model, the existence of the critical points can be correlated with generic cosmological solutions that might really decide the fate and/or the origin of the cosmic evolution.

The above interplay between a cosmological model and the corresponding phase space is possible due to an existing isomorphism between exact solutions of the cosmological field equations and points in the equivalent phase space spanned by given variables $(x, y, ...)$. When we replace the original field variables H, ρ_{cdm}, ρ_{gde}, etc., by the phase space variables $x = x(H, \rho_{cdm}, ...)$, $y = y(H, \rho_{cdm}, ...)$, ..., we have to keep in mind that, at the same time, we trade the original set of non-linear second order differential equations in respect to the cosmological time t (cosmological field equations), by a set of first order ordinary differential equations with respect to the variable $\tau = \ln a$: $x' = f(x, y, ...)$, $y' = g(x, y, ..)$, etc. The most important feature of the latter autonomous system of ODE is that the functions $f(x, y, ...)$, $g(x, y, ...)$, ..., do not depend explicitly on the parameter τ. In other words, we are trading the study of the cosmological dynamics of $H = H(t)$, $\rho_{cdm} = \rho_{cdm}(t)$, ..., by the study of the flux in τ-parameter of the equivalent autonomous system of ODE. The critical points of this system $P_i : (x_i, y_i, ...)$, i. e., the roots of the system of algebraic equations $f(x, y, ...) = 0$, $g(x, y, ...) = 0$, ..., correspond to solutions of the original system of cosmological equations. If a given equilibrium point $P_a : (x_a, y_a, ...)$ is a (global) stable attractor, i. e., small linear perturbations around P_a: $x \to x_a + \xi(\tau)$, $y \to y_a + \zeta(\tau)$, ..., decay with τ,[1] then, independent on the initial conditions chosen $x(\tau_0) = x_0$, $y(\tau_0) = y_0, ...$, every orbit in the phase space will approach P_a into the future ($\{\tau : \tau > \tau_0\}$), i. e., the stable (global) attractor is the end point of any orbit in Ψ. On the contrary, if a given critical point $P_s : (x_s, y_s, ...)$ were unstable, i. e., small perturbations around P_s uncontrollably grow up with τ, then this point were a past attractor or, also, the source point of any orbit in the phase space. For a third class of critical points, the so called "saddle points", depending on the initial conditions chosen, orbits in Ψ can approach to this point, spend some time around it and then be repelled from it to finally approach to the stable attractor (if it exists).[2] Suppose we have a typical phase portrait, composed of a source critical point P_s, a saddle point P_*, and a stable (global) attractor P_a. Each one of these points corresponds to given solutions of the original cosmological equations, $H = H_s(z)$, $H = H_*(z)$, and $H = H_a(z)$, respectively. In the above expressions z is the redshift which is related with τ: $\tau = -\ln(z + 1)$. A also typical orbit in the phase space will start at P_s for $\tau = -\infty$, then will approach to P_* and, after a finite (perhaps sufficiently long) $\Delta\tau$, will be repelled by P_* to finally be attracted towards P_a. The parallel history in terms of the equivalent cosmological dynamics will be the following. The expansion starts with a Hubble parameter dynamics $H = H_s(z)$ then, as the Universe expands, the cosmic history enters a transient period characterized by the dynamics dictated by $H = H_*(z)$. After a perhaps long yet finite period Δz the cosmic expansion will abandon the latter phase to enter into a stage which dynamics obeys $H = H_a(z)$ lasting for ever.

We want to underline that in spite of the existing isomorphism between particular solutions of the cosmological field equations of a given model and points of the equivalent phase space, most of the exact particular solutions of the field equations can not be associated with critical points. These solutions can be picked up only under very specific initial conditions on the phase space orbits, i. e., these will be unstable solutions. If, for instance, there are not found fixed points which could be associated with CDM-dominated solution, this would mean that even if this is a particular exact solution of the cosmological field equations, it can not describe a matter-dominated stage of the cosmic expansion lasting for enough time as to produce the observed amount of cosmic structure. This result would dismiss a given model since it is not able to explain one of the main features of the accepted cosmological paradigm.

---

[1] This occurs if the eigenvalues of the Jacobian matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} f_x & f_y & \cdots \\ g_x & g_y & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \cdots \end{pmatrix},$$

all have negative real parts.

[2] Our discussion here is oversimplified since, in general, critical points can be of many types, for instance, spiral, etc. Besides, there can be found also (un)stable manifolds such as cycles. To worsen things there can coexist several local attractors, saddle points, etc.

III. SIMPLIFIED GDE MODEL WHERE $\rho_{gde} \propto H$

In this section we shall investigate the phase space dynamics of the simplified (approximate) GDE model when time-dependence of the Hubble horizon's radius is ignored [12]. We start with the simplest situation when there is not additional non-gravitational interaction between the GDE and the CDM.

A. Non-interacting model

For the flat FRW universe filled with GDE, CDM, and radiation, the corresponding Friedmann equation is written as

$$3H^2 = \rho_{gde} + \rho_{cdm} + \rho_r, \tag{4}$$

where ρ_{cdm} is the energy density of (pressureless) cold dark matter, ρ_r is the energy density of radiation, and, ρ_{gde} is the GDE energy density assumed to be given by Eq.(1). The energy conservation equations for the different components are:

$$\begin{aligned} &\dot{\rho}_{cdm} + 3H\rho_{cdm} = 0,\ \dot{\rho}_r + 4H\rho_r = 0, \\ &\dot{\rho}_{gde} + 3H\rho_{gde}(1+\omega_{gde}) = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where ω_{gde} is the GDE EOS parameter. The definition for the GDE energy density (1), together with Eq.(5), yield to the following relationship:

$$\frac{\dot{\rho}_{gde}}{H\rho_{gde}} = \frac{\dot{H}}{H^2} = -3(1+\omega_{gde}). \tag{6}$$

It will be useful to have several quantities written in terms of the dimensionless parameter of GDE energy density $\Omega_{gde} \equiv \rho_{gde}/3H^2$ and of the dimensionless energy density parameter of the radiation component $\Omega_r \equiv \rho_r/3H^2$. In this regard, by taking the time derivative of the Friedmann equation (4) and, considering equations (4), and (5), one is left with

$$3(1+\omega_{gde}) = \frac{3 - 3\Omega_{gde} + \Omega_r}{2 - \Omega_{gde}} = -\frac{\dot{H}}{H^2}. \tag{7}$$

Hence, for the GDE state parameter one obtains $\omega_{gde} = -(3-\Omega_r)/[3(2-\Omega_{gde})]$, while for the deceleration parameter: $q = 2 + 3\omega_{gde}$.

In order to put the cosmological equations in the form of an autonomous system of ODE, we choose appropriate phase space variables: Ω_{gde} and Ω_r, or, for sake of simplicity and compactness of writing,

$$x \equiv \Omega_{gde},\ \ y \equiv \Omega_r. \tag{8}$$

After this choice the following autonomous system of ODE can be obtained:

$$x' = x\left[\frac{3-3x+y}{2-x}\right],\ y' = -2y\left[\frac{1+x-y}{2-x}\right], \tag{9}$$

where the tilde denotes derivative with respect to the variable $\tau \equiv \ln a (d\tau = Hdt)$. The phase space relevant to the present study is given by the following bounded triangular region in (x,y)-plane:

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi = \{(x,y)|0 \le x \le 1,\ 0 \le y \le 1, \\ 0 \le x+y \le 1\}. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

In terms of the above variables, the Friedmann equation can be written in the form of the following constraint: $\Omega_{cdm} = 1 - x - y$, besides, the GDE EOS parameter can be written as $\omega_{gde} = (y-3)/[3(2-x)]$.

Three equilibrium points $P_{c_i} : (x_{c_i}, y_{c_i})$ can be found in Ψ, which correspond to different phases of the cosmic evolution:

1. Radiation-dominated phase:

$$P_r : (0,1),\ \Omega_{cdm} = 0,\ \Omega_r = 1,\ \Omega_{gde} = 0.$$

This is a decelerating expansion solution ($q = 1$). The eigenvalues of the linearization matrix corresponding to this equilibrium point are: $\lambda_1 = 2$, $\lambda_2 = 1$, so that it is a unstable critical point (past attractor) in Ψ. The GDE state parameter is $\omega_{gde} = -1/3$.

2. CDM-dominated phase:

$$P_m : (0,0),\ \Omega_{cdm} = 1,\ \Omega_r = 0,\ \Omega_{gde} = 0.$$

This phase of the cosmic evolution is characterized also by decelerated expansion ($q = 1/2$). The existence of this solution is necessary for the formation of the observed amount of structure. The eigenvalues of the corresponding linearization matrix are: $\lambda_1 = -1$, $\lambda_2 = 3/2$, so that it is a saddle critical point in Ψ. For the GDE state parameter we obtain $\omega_{gde} = -1/2$.

3. GDE-dominated, de Sitter phase:

$$P_{dS} : (1,0),\ \Omega_{cdm} = 0,\ \Omega_r = 0,\ \Omega_{gde} = 1.$$

This late-time phase corresponds to an inflationary solution ($q = -1$). The eigenvalues of the linearization matrix for P_{dS} are: $\lambda_1 = -4$, $\lambda_2 = -3$, so that the solution is a future attractor. This equilibrium point mimics cosmological constant behavior since $\omega_{gde} = -1$.

The global structure of the phase space shows that orbits in Ψ converge into the τ-past towards the radiation-dominated stage. In the forward τ-direction, depending on the initial conditions, these orbits evolve for some time in the neighbourhood of the saddle matter-dominated point, until they are repelled from this point to, finally, converge towards the GDE-dominated future de Sitter attractor. This model correctly describes the fundamental stages of the cosmic evolution arising within the presently accepted cosmological paradigm: i) a stage of radiation domination from which, ii) a period of matter-radiation equality and subsequent matter domination emerge, followed by iii) a late-time inflationary stage.

B. Interacting model

Non-gravitational interactions have proven useful to overcome the coincidence problem in the context of GR models of dark energy. Actually, consideration of non-minimal coupling or, alternatively, of additional non-gravitational interactions between matter and the dark energy has been repeatedly invoked to get late-time matter-scaling attractors which allow accelerated expansion [18–20]. In the case of a quintessence, or a scalar field, it is expected to couple explicitly to ordinary matter unless some special symmetry prevents or suppresses the coupling [18, 21]. Besides, it is intuitive to imagine that, at least in principle, the different components of the cosmic mixture may exchange energy-momentum. Although there exist stringent constraints on additional non-gravitational interactions coming from five-force experiments, given the yet unknown nature of the cold dark matter and of the dark energy, it is possible to hypothesize a certain exchange of energy-momentum between these constituents of the cosmic substratum [22].

In the case when additional non-gravitational interaction between the GDE and the CDM is considered the corresponding energy densities no longer satisfy independent conservation laws. They obey, instead

$$\dot\rho_{cdm}+3H\rho_{cdm}=Q,$$
$$\dot\rho_{gde}+3H\rho_{gde}(1+\omega_{gde})=-Q, \tag{11}$$

where Q is the interaction term which we take to be given by Eq.(3). This interaction term is a trivial generalization which comprises several plausible non-gravitational couplings studied in the bibliography. For instance, for $a=0$ one gets $Q=3bH\rho_{cdm}$. Such a coupling arises in string theory or after conformal transformations within Brans-Dicke theory [23]. If choose $a=b$ one gets $Q=3bH(\rho_{cdm}+\rho_{gde})$, an interaction term that was derived in Ref.[24] while searching for a dynamical resolution of the coincidence problem.

In the presence of an interaction term Q the equation (7) has to be replaced by the following:

$$\frac{\dot\rho_{gde}}{H\rho_{gde}}=\frac{\dot H}{H^2}=-3(1+\omega_{gde})-\frac{Q}{H\rho_{gde}}. \tag{12}$$

We use same variables as before (8) and we obtain the following autonomous system of ODE:

$$x'=-x\frac{\dot H}{H^2},\;\; y'=-2y\left(2+\frac{\dot H}{H^2}\right),$$
$$\frac{\dot H}{H^2}=-\frac{3-3x+y-Q/3H^3}{2-x}, \tag{13}$$

where $Q/3H^3=3ax+3b(1-x-y)$. Here the phase space is the same as in Eq.(10). The magnitudes of relevance can be written in terms of the phase space variables ($\Omega_{cdm}=1-x-y$): $q=[1-2x+y-Q/3H^3]/(2-x)$, and $\omega_{gde}=-[x(3-y)+2Q/3H^3]/[3x(2-x)]$.

The following equilibrium points are found:

1. Non-interacting, radiation-dominated phase

$$P_r:(0,1),\;\Omega_r=1,\;Q=0,$$

while ω_{gde} is undefined. Since the eigenvalues of the linearization matrix, $\lambda_1=2$, $\lambda_2=1+3b$, are both positive (recall that we are considering here that both a and b are positive quantities), this is a unstable critical point, i. e., a past attractor which corresponds to decelerating expansion solution ($q=1$).

2. CDM-dominated phase

$$P_m:(0,0),\;\Omega_{cdm}=1,\;Q=9bH^3.$$

As before the GDE-EOS parameter ω_{gde} is undefined in this case. The eigenvalues of the linearization matrix corresponding to this critical point are: $\lambda_1=-1-3b$, and $\lambda_2=3(1-b)/2$, so that this solution is a saddle critical point if $b<1$, while for $b>1$ it is the future attractor in Ψ. Given that $q=(1-3b)/2$, for $b>1/3$ the solution is inflationary ($q<0$).

3. CDM/GDE-scaling solution

$$P_{m-sc}:\left(\frac{1-b}{1+a-b},0\right),\;\Omega_{cdm}=\frac{a}{1+a-b}$$
$$Q=\frac{9aH^3}{1+a-b},\;\omega_{gde}=-\frac{1+a-b}{1-b}.$$

This equilibrium point exists whenever $b<1$. In this case the energy densities of CDM and of GDE scale as

$\Omega_{cdm}/\Omega_{gde} = a/(1-b)$.[3] As long as $q = -1$ it is an inflationary solution. The eigenvalues of the Jacobian matrix at linearisation around P_{m-sc} are: $\lambda_1 = -4$, and $\lambda_2 = -[3(1-b)(1+a-b)]/(1+2a-b)$, so that the corresponding solution is the future attractor whenever it exists. The GDE EOS parameter $\omega_{gde} < -1$, hence, in this regime the GDE always behaves like phantom matter.

Consideration of an interaction term of the form $Q = 3H(a\rho_{cdm} + b\rho_{gde})$ modifies the topology of the phase space (10) by replacing the GDE-dominated (de Sitter) solution in the non-interacting case by a CDM/GDE scaling solution. It is curious, however, that at this critical point the expansion is de Sitter: $H = \alpha(1+a-b)/[3(1-b)] = H_0$. Besides, given the scaling nature of P_{m-sc} ($\rho_{cdm}/\rho_{gde} = a/(1-b)$), and taking into account the Friedmann equation, one is left with constant $\rho_{cdm} = \alpha^2[a(1+a-b)]/[3(1-b)^2] = \rho_{cdm,0}$, and $\rho_{gde} = \alpha^2(1+a-b)/[3(1-b)] = \rho_{gde,0}$. This seemingly strange situation may be explained in the following way: usually the energy density of dark matter decays $\propto a^{-3}$ as the universe expands, while the energy density of the phantom GDE fluid ($\omega_{gde} < -1$) should increase with the expansion. However, due to the non-gravitational interaction Q both fluids exchange energy. In this case the flux of energy is from the GDE into the CDM at a rate which guarantees that no neat change in the energy density of either fluid occurs as the expansion proceeds.

We want to notice that, since the scaling (acceleratingly expanding $q = -1$) solution whenever it exists is the global future attractor, then, independent on the initial conditions chosen, scaling between dark matter and dark energy always dictates the late-time cosmological behavior. In consequence the additional non-gravitational interaction between the cold dark matter and the ghost dark energy does actually smooth out the coincidence problem.

At this point we want to recall that the present model of QCD GDE, where $\rho_{gde} = \alpha H$, i. e., where $\epsilon = 0$ and time-dependence of the horizon is neglected, is just an approximation which is valid only whenever the ghost dark energy dominates the cosmic evolution. Hence one should not expect that this is a good model to explain the whole cosmic history. This means that we should not take too much seriously critical points other than the GDE-dominated one. As a matter of fact, in the next section where the more physically involved model with time-dependent horizon is explored, $\rho_{gde} = \alpha H(1-\epsilon)$, we shall see that only one critical point is found which is related with ghost dark energy dominance.

IV. TIME-DEPENDENT HORIZON

Within the context of QCD GDE models of accelerated expansion the contribution from time-dependence of the radius of the horizon ($\propto \epsilon$) is usually neglected [3–6, 8–13], however this assumption is no more than a convenient simplification of the model. In general, the contribution coming from the dynamics of the horizon through the quantity ϵ is to be taken under consideration. In the present section we shall be considering how the time-dependence of the horizon impacts the asymptotic properties of the Veneziano ghost dark energy model. As in the precedent section the cases when the CDM and the GDE are bounded only gravitationally and when there is additional non-gravitational interaction between them will be studied separately.

A. Non-interacting model

Here the energy density of the Veneziano GDE is given by Eq.(2) and the dynamics of the horizon is encoded in the quantity $\epsilon = -\dot{H}/2H^2$. The Friedmann equation (4) and the continuity equations (5) hold true, however, in place of (6) one now gets

$$\frac{\dot{\rho}_{gde}}{H\rho_{gde}} = \frac{\rho'_{gde}}{\rho_{gde}} = -3(1+\omega_{gde}) = -\frac{\epsilon'}{1-\epsilon} - 2\epsilon. \qquad (14)$$

Besides, by taking the derivative of the Friedmann equation and considering the definition of ϵ, one gets $4\epsilon = 3\omega_{gde}\Omega_{gde} + 3 + \Omega_r$, or $\omega_{gde} = [4\epsilon - 3 - \Omega_r]/3\Omega_{gde}$.

In order to investigate the phase space dynamics of this model it is convenient to introduce the following variables: $x = \alpha/3H$, $y = \Omega_r$, and ϵ. In terms of these variables the Friedmann constraint is written as ($\Omega_{gde} = x(1-\epsilon)$): $\Omega_{cdm} = 1 - x(1-\epsilon) - y$, while $q = -1 + 2\epsilon$, and $\omega_{gde} = (4\epsilon - 3 - y)/3x(1-\epsilon)$.

The following autonomous system of ODE is obtained:

$$\begin{aligned} &x' = 2x\,\epsilon, \;\; y' = -4y\,(1-\epsilon), \\ &\epsilon' = \{[(3-2\epsilon)x - 4](1-\epsilon) + 1 - y\}/x. \end{aligned} \qquad (15)$$

Since $0 \leq \Omega_{gde} \leq 1$, and since we are focusing in expanding solutions only $\Rightarrow$ $\dot{H} \leq 0$, then $0 \leq \epsilon \leq 1$. The phase space where to look for physically meaningful critical points is defined as the following 3D compact region:

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_\epsilon = \{(x,y,\epsilon)|\; &0 \leq x \leq 1,\; 0 \leq y \leq 1, \\ &0 \leq \epsilon \leq 1,\;\; 0 \leq 1 - x(1-\epsilon) - y \leq 1\}. \end{aligned} \qquad (16)$$

---

[3] Since, according to the observational evidence, at present $0 < \Omega_{cdm}/\Omega_{gde} < 1 \Rightarrow 0 < a + b < 1$.

Only one equilibrium point of (15) can be found in Ψ_ϵ:

$$P_{dS} : (1, 0, 0),\ \ \Omega_{gde} = 1,\ \ q = -1,\ \ \omega_{gde} = -1.$$

This point corresponds to a de Sitter solution since, $\epsilon = 0 \Rightarrow\ \ H = H_0 = const$. It can be associated with a transient stage of the cosmic evolution since, as long as the eigenvalues of the linearisation matrix $\lambda_1 = 2$, $\lambda_2 = -4$, $\lambda_3 = -3$, are of opposite sign, P_{dS} is a saddle point in this case.

B. Interacting model

As before we shall consider an interaction term of the form (3). The GDE EOS parameter ω_{gde} is given as in the former subsection recalling that now $\Omega_{gde} = x(1-\epsilon)$. The continuity equations (5) are replaced by (11), while (14) is replaced by

$$\frac{\rho'_{gde}}{\rho_{gde}} = -3(1 + \omega_{gde}) - \frac{Q}{H\rho_{gde}} = -\frac{\epsilon'}{1-\epsilon} - 2\epsilon.$$

The following autonomous system of ODE is obtained:

$$\begin{aligned}&\epsilon' = \{[(3 - 2\epsilon)x - 4](1 - \epsilon) + 1 - y + Q/3H^3\}/x,\\ &x' = 2x\epsilon,\ \ y' = -4y(1 - \epsilon),\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where $Q/3H^3 = 3ax(1 - \epsilon) + 3b[1 - x(1 - \epsilon) - y]$. The physical phase space coincides with the one for the non-interacting case Ψ_ϵ in Eq.(16).

The additional interaction between the dark matter and the Veneziano ghost dark energy transforms the de Sitter critical point P_{dS} into a de Sitter-CDM/GDE scaling point:

$$P_{m-sc} : \left(\frac{1-b}{1+a-b}, 0, 0\right),\ \ \Omega_{cdm} = \frac{a}{1+a-b},$$

with $q = -1$, and $\omega_{gde} = -(1+a-b)/(1-b) < -1$. This critical point exists if $b \leq 1$, $a \geq 0$. Notice that, as it happened with the approximate model where $\rho_{gde} = \alpha H$ (subsection III B), the non-gravitational interaction (3) produces a very strange situation where the expansion is in a de Sitter stage $H = H_0$ (recall that $\epsilon = 0$),

$$3H^2 = 3H_0^2 = \frac{1+a-b}{1-b}\,\rho_{gde} = \frac{1+a-b}{a}\rho_{cdm},$$

which is fuelled by a mixture of dust (CDM) and a phantom fluid (GDE with EOS $\omega_{gde} < -1$). Due to the non-gravitational interaction there is a transfer of energy and momentum from the GDE component into the CDM one, resulting in no neat change of the energy densities $\rho_{gde} = \rho_{gde,0}$ and $\rho_{cdm} = \rho_{cdm,0}$.

To judge about the stability of the above critical point, without loss of generality, we consider a particular case when $a = b$. In this particular case the eigenvalues of the Jacobian matrix at linearisation are: $\lambda_1 = -4$, and $\lambda_{2,3} = -[1 - 5a \pm \sqrt{25 - 58a + 49a^2}]/[2(1 - a)]$, which show that P_{m-sc} can be either a saddle equilibrium point if $a < 1/5$, or a stable future attractor otherwise ($1/5 < a < 1$).

V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

According to the accepted cosmological paradigm the main features of the cosmic history of our universe are: i) an early period of inflation, ii) density inhomogeneities produced from quantum fluctuations during inflation, iii) a flat, critical density, acceleratingly expanding universe, iv) energy density budget consisting of roughly 2/3 of dark energy (DE) and 1/3 of cold dark matter (CDM), and v) matter content: 29% – CDM, 4% – baryons, and 0.3% – neutrinos. Any successful cosmological model should be able to explain the above mentioned features. In particular a transient stage of matter-dominance is mandatory to explain the observed amount of cosmic structure. In this paper we have demonstrated that, as a matter of fact, the so called Veneziano (also QCD) ghost dark energy model [3–17] can not be a successful cosmological model in the sense mentioned above, since there are not critical points in the equivalent phase space of the model which can be associated with a transient stage of matter-dominance. There is only one critical point which, depending on whether there are or not additional non-gravitational interactions between CDM and GDE, can be either a matter-scaling solution depicting de Sitter inflation (saddle or stable) in the former case, or a GDE-dominated de Sitter saddle critical point in the latter case. This does not mean that a particular matter-dominated solution of the cosmological equations could not be picked out under very specific initial conditions. What this really means is that in case such a particular solution is found it will be very unstable, so that it would not last for enough time as to account for the observed amount of cosmic structure.

From the results of the study in section III it can be inferred that the simplified QCD GDE model where $\rho_{gde} = \alpha H$ is suitable from the cosmological point of view since, besides the de Sitter point (future attractor) there are critical points associated with radiation-dominance (past attractor) and cold dark matter-dominance (saddle point). Notice, however, that there is no way in which the latter points can be retrieved from the more realistic model where $\rho_{gde} = \alpha H(1 - \epsilon)$ in the limit when $\epsilon \to 0$. This does not mean that our study is not mathematically consistent (it is), but rather that one can not pretend to describe the entire cosmic history with an approximate model which is valid only during a particular stage of GDE dominance ($\epsilon = 0$). Hence the radiation-dominated and CDM-dominated critical points in section III do not actually belong in the phase space of the Veneziano ghost dark energy model.

Another interesting feature of the interacting QCD GDE phase space is related with the bifurcation phenomenon. It is linked with sudden changes of the topology of the phase space when jumping from one region in the parameter space (a, b) into a neighbouring one. This phenomenon is possible since the system of ODE (17) is a two-parameters system of ordinary differential equations. There arise certain (critical) curves in the space (a, b) which separate regions which are linked with different, topologically non-equivalent phase spaces. As an illustration, notice that the critical point P_{m-sc} in section IV B exists only if $0 \leq b < 1$. This means that in crossing the bifurcation line $\mathcal{B}_l : \{(a, b) = (a, 1)\}$ the topology of the phase space suddenly changes: for $b < 1$ there exists one critical point, while for $b > 1$ there is not any critical point in Ψ_ϵ. Another aspect of the bifurcation phenomenon in this case is related with the stability properties of the critical point P_{m-sc} itself, which depend also on the values of the pair (a, b). For more details on the bifurcation phenomenon within the frame of QCD GDE models see the reference [14] where the issue was thoroughly discussed.

Our conclusion is that there are at least two good reasons why we should rule out the Veneziano ghost as a model for the dark energy: i) it is plagued by classical instability against small perturbations of the background due to negativity of the sound speed squared, and ii) it is unable to explain the formation of structure in our universe. While the former drawback above might be circumvented through more or less plausible arguments [4, 10, 14] the latter one is conclusive.

The authors thank SNI of Mexico for support. The work of R G-S was partly supported by SIP20120991, SIP20131811, COFAA-IPN, and EDI-IPN grants. I Q and M T-M thank "Programa PRO-SNI, Universidad de Guadalajara" for support under grant No 146912.

[1] P. J. E. Peebles, B. Ratra, Rev. Mod. Phys. **75** (2003) 559 [astro-ph/0207347]; E. J. Copeland, M. Sami, S. Tsujikawa, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **15** (2006) 1753 [hep-th/0603057]; S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov, Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys. **4** (2007) 115 [hep-th/0601213]; J. Frieman, M. Turner, D. Huterer, Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys. **46** (2008) 385 [arXiv:0803.0982]; K. Bamba, S. Capozziello, S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov, Astrophys. Space Sci. **342** (2012) 155 [arXiv:1205.3421].

[2] S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov, Phys. Rev. D **72** (2005) 023003 [hep-th/0505215]; S. Capozziello, V. F. Cardone, E. Elizalde, S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov, Phys. Rev. D **73** (2006) 043512 [astro-ph/0508350].

[3] F. R. Urban, A. R. Zhitnitsky, Phys. Lett. B **688** (2010) 9 [arXiv:0906.2162]; Phys. Rev. D **80** (2009) 063001 [arXiv:0906.2165]; JCAP **0909** (2009) 018 [arXiv:0906.3546]; Nucl. Phys. B **835** (2010) 135 [arXiv:0909.2684].

[4] A. R. Zhitnitsky, Phys. Rev. D **82** (2010) 103520 [arXiv:1004.2040]; Phys. Rev. D **84** (2011) 124008 [arXiv:1105.6088]; B. Holdom, Phys. Lett. B **697** (2011) 351 [arXiv:1012.0551].

[5] N. Ohta, Phys. Lett. B **695** (2011) 41 [arXiv:1010.1339].

[6] R.-G. Cai, Z.-L. Tuo, H.-B. Zhang, Q. Su, Phys. Rev. D **84** (2011) 123501 [arXiv:1011.3212].

[7] R.-G. Cai, Z.-L. Tuo, Y.-B. Wu, Y.-Y. Zhao, Phys. Rev. D **86** (2012) 023511 [arXiv:1201.2494].

[8] K. Karami, M. Mousivand, arXiv:1209.2044; E. Ebrahimi, A. Sheykhi, arXiv:1209.3147; A. Sheykhi, E. Ebrahimi, Y. Yosefi, arXiv:1210.0781.

[9] E. Ebrahimi, A. Sheykhi, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **20** (2011) 2369 [arXiv:1106.3504]; arXiv:1211.2686.

[10] A. Rozas-Fernandez, Phys. Lett. B **709** (2012) 313 [arXiv:1106.0056].

[11] E. Ebrahimi, A. Sheykhi, Phys. Lett. B **706** (2011) 19 [arXiv:1105.5680], Kh. Saaidi, A. Aghamohammadi, B. Sabet, arXiv:1203.4518; K. Karami, K. Fahimi, arXiv:1208.6026.

[12] C.-J. Feng, X.-Z. Li, X.-Y. Shen, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **27** (2012) 1250182 [arXiv:1105.3253].

[13] A. Sheykhi, M. Sadegh Movahed, Gen. Rel. Grav. **44** (2012) 449 [arXiv:1104.4713]; H. Wei, R.-G. Cai, Eur. Phys. J. C **59** (2009) 99 [arXiv:0707.4052]; R.-G. Cai, Q. Su, Phys. Rev. D **81** (2010) 103514 [arXiv:0912.1943]; H. Wei, R.-G. Cai, Phys. Rev. D **71** (2005) 043504 [hep-th/0412045]; Z.-K. Guo, R.-G. Cai, Y.-Z. Zhang, JCAP **0505** (2005) 002 [astro-ph/0412624].

[14] C.-J. Feng, X.-Z. Li, P. Xi, JHEP **1205** (2012) 046 [arXiv:1204.4055].

[15] G. Veneziano, Nucl. Phys. B **159** (1979) 213; C. Rosenzweig, J. Schechter, C. G. Trahern, Phys. Rev. D **21** (1980) 3388; P. Nath, R. L. Arnowitt, Phys. Rev. D **23** (1981) 473; K. Kawarabayashi, N. Ohta, Nucl. Phys. B **175** (1980) 477; Prog. Theor. Phys. **66** (1981) 1789; N. Ohta, Prog. Theor. Phys. **66** (1981) 1408.

[16] Y. B. Zeldovich, JETP Lett. **6** (1967) 316.

[17] R. Schutzhold, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89** (2002) 081302 (2002); F. R. Klinkhamer, G. E. Volovik, Phys. Rev. D **77** (2008) 085015 [arXiv:0711.3170]; Phys. Rev. D **78** (2008) 063528 [arXiv:0806.2805]; Phys. Rev. D **79** (2009) 063527 [arXiv:0811.4347].

[18] L. Amendola, Phys. Rev. D **60** (1999) 043501 [astro-ph/9904120]; Phys. Rev. D **62** (2000) 043511 [astro-ph/9908023].

[19] W. Zimdahl, D. Pavon, Phys. Lett. B **521** (2001) 133 [astro-ph/0105479]; Gen. Rel. Grav. **35** (2003) 413 [astro-ph/0210484]; B. Gumjudpai, T. Naskar, M. Sami, S. Tsujikawa, JCAP **0506** (2005) 007 [hep-th/0502191].

[20] G. Leon; Class. Quant. Grav. **26** (2009) 035008 [arXiv:0812.1013]; G. Caldera-Cabral, R. Maartens, L. A. Urena-Lopez, Phys. Rev. D **79** (2009) 063518 [arXiv:0812.1827]; M. Quartin, M. O. Calvao, S. E. Joras, R. R. R. Reis, I. Waga, JCAP **0805** (2008) 007 [arXiv:0802.0546].

[21] S. M. Carroll, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81** (1998) 3067 [astro-ph/9806099].

[22] L. P. Chimento, A. S. Jakubi, D. Pavon, W. Zimdahl, Phys. Rev. D **67** (2003) 083513 [astro-ph/0303145].

[23] C. Wetterich, Astron. Astrophys. **301** (1995) 321-328 [hep-th/9408025]; L. Amendola, Phys. Rev. D **60** (1999) 043501 [astro-ph/9904120]; Phys. Rev. D **62** (2000) 043511 [astro-ph/9908023].

[24] W. Zimdahl, D. Pavon, Phys. Lett. B **521** (2001) 133-138 [astro-ph/0105479].